



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/592,013	09/07/2006	Daniel De Kock	63514B	7014
109 7590 02/18/2009 The Dow Chemical Company Intellectual Property Section P.O. Box 1967 Midland, MI 48641-1967				
			EXAMINER CHIN, HUI H	
			ART UNIT 1796	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/18/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

## Application No.

10/592,013

## Applicant(s)

DE KOCK ET AL

## Examiner

HUI CHIN

## Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/88)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/7/2006, 8/31/2007
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Line 2: "(U)" is not understood.

Line 2: "meat" is not understood.

Corrections are required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase, "any one of claim 1" does not serve to clearly define the invention applicant intends.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase, "between 10 and 40 percent about 10 percent and 40 percent" does not serve to clearly define the invention applicant intends.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lindner (US Patent 6,846,857).

Lindner discloses a method for producing a long glass fiber-reinforced thermoplastic resin composition comprising the steps of guiding a fiber skein through a first extruder, wherein the fiber skein is impregnated with a first thermoplastic material, such as acrylonitrile/butadiene/styrene (col. 2 line 65), to be broken off into pellets, and these pellets are then mixed with a second thermoplastic material, wherein the glass fiber is at least 3 to more than 6 mm (claim 1, col. 4 lines 55-64, col. 2 line 55, col. 3 lines 50-52).

However, Lindner is silent on the relative viscosity of ABS.

Lindner discloses "the "first" thermoplastics material is a material which wets the fibers well. To this end, the first thermoplastics material is required to have lower viscosity, compared with the one of the second thermoplastics material. Thus, the first thermoplastics material has a lower viscosity (high flow) than the one of second thermoplastics material. In light of such benefit, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the long glass fiber-reinforced thermoplastic resin composition with these ABS having different viscosities with the expected success.

The limitations of claims 2 and 3 can be found in Lindner at col. 2, lines 65-66, where it discloses the ABS.

The limitations of claim 4 can be found in Lindner at col. 5, line 5, where it discloses the homogeneous blend.

The limitations of claim 5 can be found in Lindner at claim 1, where it discloses the fiber added to the first thermoplastic material.

The limitations of claim 6 can be found in Lindner at claim 8, where it discloses the fiber with at least 10% by weight. Rejection is applied to the overlapping range.

The limitations of claim 7 can be found in Lindner at claim 7, where it discloses the first material is between 10 and 40% of the matrix material.

The limitations of claims 8 and 12 can be found in Lindner at col. 2, line 55 and col. 3, line 52, where it discloses the glass roving.

The limitations of claim 9 can be found in Lindner at col. 4, line 63, where it discloses the mixing.

The limitations of claims 10 and 13 can be found in Lindner at col. 2, line 65, where it discloses the ABS.

The limitations of claim 11 can be found in Lindner at claim 1, col. 4 lines 55-64, col. 2 line 55, col. 3 lines 50-52, col. 2 line 65, where it discloses the composition.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUI CHIN whose telephone number is (571)270-7350. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday; 8:00am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on 571-272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ling-Siu Choi/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/HC/